



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

more, the same skilful and commodious construction recurs in a whole series of private mansions and smaller dwellings throughout the island. Outside "broad Knossos" itself, flourishing towns sprang up far and wide on the country sides. New and refined crafts were developed, some of them, like that of the inlaid metal-work, unsurpassed in any age or country. Artistic skill, of course, reached its acme in the great palaces themselves, the corridors, landings and porticoes of which were decked with wall paintings and high reliefs, showing in the treatment of animal life not only an extraordinary grasp of nature, but a grandiose power of composition such as the world had never seen before. Such were the great bull-grappling reliefs of the Sea Gate at Knossos and the agonistic scenes of the great palace hall.

The modernness of much of the life here revealed to us is astonishing. The elaboration of the domestic arrangements, the staircases story above story, the front places given to the ladies at shows, their fashionable flounced robes and jackets, the gloves sometimes seen on their hands or hanging from their folding chairs, their very mannerisms as seen on the frescoes, pointing their conversation with animated gestures—how strangely out of place would it all appear in a classical design! Nowhere, not even at Pompeii, have more living pictures of ancient life been called up for us than in the Minoan Palace of Knossos. The touches supplied by its closing scene are singularly dramatic—the little bath-room opening out of the Queen's parlor, with its painted clay bath, the royal draught-board flung down in the court, the vessels for anointing and the oil-jar for their filling ready to hand by the throne of the Priest-King, with the benches of his Consistory round and the sacred griffins on either side. Religion, indeed, entered in at every turn. The palaces were also temples, the tomb a shrine of the Great Mother. It was perhaps owing to the religious control of art that among all the Minoan representations—now to be numbered by thousands—no single example of indecency has come to light.

To-day we are able to trace the gradual evolution on Cretan soil of a complete system of writing from its earliest pictographic shape, through a conventionalized hieroglyphic to a linear stage of great perfection. In addition to inscribed sealings and other records some two thousand clay tablets have now come to light, mostly inventories or contracts; for though the script itself is still undeciphered the pictorial figures that often appear on these documents supply a valuable clew to their contents. The numeration also is clear, with figures representing sums up to 10,000. The inscribed sealings, signed, counter-marked and counter-signed by controlling officials, give a high idea of the elaborate machinery of government and administration under the Minoan rulers.

Simultaneously with its eastern expansion, which affected the coast of Phoenicia and Palestine as well as Cyprus, Minoan civilization now took firm hold of mainland Greece, while traces of its direct influence are found in the west Mediterranean basin—in Sicily, the Balearic Islands and Spain. At the time of the actual conquest and during the immediately succeeding period the civilization that appears at Mycenae and Tiryns, at Thebes, and Orchomenos, and at other centers of mainland Greece, though it seems to have brought with it some already assimilated Anatolian elements, is still in the broadest sense Minoan. It is only at a later stage that a more provincial offshoot came into being to which the name of Mycenaean can be properly applied. But it is clear that some vanguard at least of the Aryan Greek immigrants came into contact with this high Minoan culture at a time when it was still in

its most flourishing condition. The evidence of Homer itself is conclusive. Arms and armor described in the poems are those of the Minoan prime, the fabled shield of Achilles, like that of Herakles described by Hesiod, with its elaborate scenes and variegated metal-work, reflects the masterpieces of Minoan craftsmen in the full vigor of their art; the very episodes of epic combat receive their best illustration on the signets of the great days of Mycenae. Even the lyre to which the minstrel sang was a Minoan invention. Or, if we turn to the side of religion, the Greek temple seems to have sprung from a Minoan hall, its earliest pediment schemes are adaptations from the Minoan tympanum—such as we see in the Lions' Gate—the most archaic figures of the Hellenic Goddesses, like the Spartan Orthia, have the attributes and attendant animals of the great Minoan Mother.

Some elements of the old culture were taken over on the soil of Hellas. Others which had been crushed out in their old centers survived in the more eastern shores and islands formerly dominated by Minoan civilization, and were carried back by Phoenician and Ionian intermediaries to their old homes. In spite of the overthrow which about the twelfth century before our era fell on the old Minoan dominion and the onrush of the new conquerors from the north, much of the old tradition still survived to form the base for the fabric of the later civilization of Greece. Once more, through the darkness, the lighted torch was carried on, the first glimmering flame of which had been painfully kindled by the old Cave dwellers in that earlier Palaeolithic world.

The Roman Empire which in turn appropriated the heritage that Greece had received from Minoan Crete, placed civilization on a broader basis by welding together heterogeneous ingredients and promoting a cosmopolitan ideal. If even the primeval culture of the Reindeer Age embraced more than one race and absorbed extraneous elements from many sides, how much more is that the case with our own which grew out of the Greco-Roman! Civilization in its higher form to-day, though highly complex, forms essentially a unitary mass. It has no longer to be sought out in separate luminous centers, shining like planets through the surrounding night. Still less is it the property of one privileged country or people. Many as are the tongues of mortal men, its votaries, like the Immortals, speak a single language. Throughout the whole vast area illuminated by its quickening rays, its workers are interdependent, and pledged to a common cause. C. K.

THE EUTHYDEMUS

In the dialogues of Plato are combined all the excellence of art and the naturalness of talk. Perhaps one of the best illustrations of this is supplied by the little dialogue called the Euthydemus, though some contend that it is unworthy of Plato, and, that, in accumulating such unusual expressions, such metaphors, proverbs, historical and mythological allusions, such extraordinary reminiscences, the author intends to impress us with his erudition, but does not altogether succeed. Another student of Plato attributes all this to Plato's desire to attain a comic effect¹. The style of the Euthydemus approaches that of Aristophanes as far as Plato could safely venture, which is one of its claims to our interest. But at the same time it conforms to the most rigid rules of art and must also have been a successful polemic

¹Berg, *Metaphor and Comparison in the Dialogues of Plato*, 8.

against the two types of men whom Plato held in abhorrence. In this paper the artistic form of the dialogue will be considered first, then a brief analysis of its two parts will be presented, and, finally, some endeavor will be made to show why it was written and at whom its masked batteries were aimed.

Plato was not the first to use the dialogue for the presentation of Socrates's philosophy and method of disputation; but he made the form peculiarly his own, though Xenophon and Aeschines the Socratic were ranked with him by the ancient critics in the use of the dialogue². None of Plato's dialogues was named for Socrates, chief character in so many of them that he is an incarnation of Plato's own beliefs and theories. Socrates owes his renown, it is said, to Plato's strange desire to do this³. But Plato has done more than give in the character of Socrates simply a picture of himself. Socrates is the type of human intelligence; Plato has lifted him out of the individual into the universal. This is what gives the Dialogues their eternal quality, making them forever significant.

One could study ancient philosophy by the style alone. Poetic forms were tried, first by the Seven Sages and by Heraclitus. Philosophy appeared in its purest and simplest form in Xenophanes. With Parmenides and the introduction of dialectic the perfect form of the dialogue was reached. The forms of poetry were thus tried for philosophy and were found inadequate; prose must be its medium. But poetry had evolved the drama and in comedy there was a kind of dialogue which could very well serve Plato for a model. Epicharmus had shown the way. His plays were said to abound in philosophical discussions. A polemical dialogue, too, with its irony more closely than any other would approach comedy. The mimes of Sophron and the comedies of Aristophanes were familiar to Plato's public; their influence appears in the Euthydemus and also in the Symposium.

Why should a writer with a serious message for the world produce a piece so full of caricature and downright buffoonery? For the conception of a harmonization of philosophies, such as Plato had, an artistic nature was a prerequisite⁴; and this philosophy allowed no expression that was inartistic. Where the form is to be referred so directly to the idea as we find in Plato, there is a marked tendency towards beauty of form, and the contemplation of the idea in that form becomes a matter of aesthetic appreciation. Where knowledge and life so interfuse, knowledge can best be communicated by a portrayal that is living, and, since the informing knowledge is ideal, this portrayal must be poetic. At the same time it must be argumentative, if it is to adapt itself to the argumentative character of its material. These two conditions were met by the philosophical dialogue, and thus Plato occupies a position intermediate between the Socratic method of con-

troversy and scientific investigation and the purely scientific system of Aristotle⁵. This accounts for Plato's use of the dialogue as a form in which to express his ideas.

But the dialogue is adapted to philosophy as well as to drama; for philosophical writings set forth the development of certain ideas, and, if you will observe your consciousness a moment, you will appreciate the fact that every mind is made by thinking the theater of a kind of dialogue. All knowledge that comes into the mind has a dramatic quality. Thus, in selecting the dialogue, Plato chose that form of art which most faithfully reflects the experience of the mind⁶.

There is still another side to the question. The Athenians had the habit of debate. Plato had had glib experience of all the verbal fallacies then current and his extraordinary skill in disputation had gained for him many triumphs in actual disputation, no doubt, long before he did any writing. His genius, therefore, found in dialogue its natural, its most appropriate form. The tetralogies of Antiphon indicate that formal debate had attained to a considerable technique. There is nothing surprising in the fact that this technique should be adaptable to dialogue. Philosophy thus draws from rhetoric on the one hand and from drama on the other.

Plato's philosophy, after all, was conservative. His earnest purpose was not to penetrate more deeply into the mystery of the world, but to establish and to maintain all that had been won in knowledge by his teacher, Parmenides⁷. Democritus and the atomic theory did not appeal to Plato; neither did they appeal to Athens.

Plato's general purpose was very much the same in all the Dialogues. The dialogue form itself is to be attributed

to Plato's desire to avoid the appearance of theoretical coldness and exclusiveness in his investigations of the highest concerns of men; and rather to connect that investigation, through Socrates, with daily experiences, and thus to represent it as closely related to common life. He tried also in the garb of conversation to bring his thinking to general comprehension and to commend it to general acceptance. He avoided the impression of arbitrary invention, gained the effect of real occurrence, and gave an obvious explanation of the fact that the memory of such a conversation retained details more accurately in some places and in others could recall only the most important things said⁸.

Plato's particular purpose in the Euthydemus was to combat the sophistic tendencies of the age. For that was the Brass Age—age of the Sophists and the shameless. The Megarian School had done its best—and worst—and the Socratic method had been annexed with the utmost dispatch by men who were sophoi for what they could get out of it. The new method was employed, not to ascertain truth nor yet to secure jus-

²Hermann, *Platonische Philosophie*, 406.

³Lutowski, *Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic*, 195.

⁴Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 2.569f.

⁵But Aristotle is always conscious of the suppressed antagonist. The dialogue is not quite dead.

⁶See Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 2.576. Compare O. Apelt, *Platonische Aufsätze*, 73.

⁷Plato, *Parmenides* 128 A.

⁸Towle, *Introduction to his edition of Plato's Protagoras*, 15.

tice, but to get on in the world; and you got on in the world best by beating somebody else. Fallacies were fashionable at Athens; the political clubs would always welcome a clever talker, so that fake logic and the demagogue went arm in arm. The Athenians, says a French Platonist, had the worst government in the world and were absolutely charmed and delighted with it⁹. But these men who were so eager to become sophoi were so perverse as to assail the laws that lay at the very foundations of logic. Once or twice already Plato had clashed with this bastard dialectic, and it was now time to engage in a decisive battle with it. Aristotle devoted a whole work to the conflict. Is it surprising that Plato anticipated Aristotle or that the Euthydemus should be a polemic?

There are few weapons so effective in disputation as irony. The comedy of the times, the Old Comedy, had shown how the thing should be done. A play had been aimed at Socrates himself. Consequently it was almost a conventional form that Plato adopted. The comparison to the style of Aristophanes is obvious¹⁰.

Thus the Euthydemus occupies no unimportant post in the sacred band of the Dialogues; it is, in a way, the necessary complement to those dialogues in which Plato makes war on the negative and fallacious reasoning of the Sophists. Its polemical nature necessitates satire, and who could be a better model than Aristophanes?

A French critic has this appreciation of the Euthydemus¹¹:

'The careful and studied plan of the Euthydemus, more than one page of it seeming to have been borrowed from some finished comedy, the various conversations which follow one another like scenes where variety relieves without destroying the unity of the composition, the mixture of the serious and the comic, the wit and humor in it all, the choice of characters, the order and the purpose of the conversations, all conspire to the same end, the overthrow of the Sophists. We see them come on the scene with all their prestige and popularity, go through their parts with all the cleverness of which they were capable, and, when they had finished, out they go unmasked, defeated, twice discredited; for they had been defeated in disputation and had been made ridiculous into the bargain'.

In the prologue spoken by Socrates, with Crito as a foil, the purpose of the piece is indicated (Chapters 1-4). It is, first, to discomfit the Sophists and their false logic, and, secondly, to exalt the true knowledge, sophia. The dialogue then falls naturally into three divisions or acts; in each there are two scenes, the second of which serves to explain and to offset the first. The setting is the dialogue between Crito and Socrates. In this setting two dialogues are contained; in the first the Socratic method is contrasted with eristic, the method of the Sophists; in the second the new rhetoric assails them both with the same general condemnation. The first Socrates gives at great length in his conversation

with his friend Crito; the second Crito gives only in substance.

In the first dialogue variety is attained by having eristic represented by a brace of disputants, sophia by a single champion. In the cross-questioning to which Cleinias is subjected, the two Sophists alternate in their questioning and this merely puzzles the youth. Back and forth they toss him, to his great bewilderment. In his replies to Socrates's questions his progress is in striking contrast; for he admits that virtue can be taught. This was an admission; for the Greeks generally did not believe that virtue could be taught¹². Thus Cleinias brings out sharp and clear the distinction between eristic and sophia; they not only differ in effectiveness, but their spirit is not the same. And the Greeks, as well as ourselves, believed in the practical power of theory, understanding theory, of course, in the right meaning of the word. Again, in the first dialogue the rivals are contrasted both as to their pretensions and as to their methods.

After each part of the dialogue with the Sophists, which is full of animation and insincerity (they appear as irony and mock reverence in Socrates), comes the sober, serious talk of Crito and Socrates. Crito is the foil beside which Socrates appears to the best advantage. When, however, he is pitted against the two Sophists, he is obliged to descend to their level.

Ctesippus is brought in to learn the method of the Eristics, just as Cleinias learns by the method of Socrates; their progress is contrasted, for Ctesippus learns just enough to confute his teachers and Cleinias learns enough to take an active part in further investigation, as it were.

To bring out all these central figures more distinctly, to accent their values, there are two groups in the background; first, the company following the Sophists, and, secondly, the company of friends who accompany Cleinias.

The nature of the dialogue can now be seen from a brief outline of it¹³. It begins, as has been noted, with the conversation between Socrates and Crito. Crito asks Socrates who the men were with whom he had seen him talking so long in the Lyceum the other day: the crowd about them had been so great that he was unable to get near enough to hear anything they were saying. Accordingly, Socrates gives him an account of the two Eristics, Dionysodoros and Euthydemus, and their previous activities. So deeply had their knowledge and skill impressed him that he was eager to learn of them; and he invites Crito to join him and go to school to these wonderful new teachers of wisdom, for the Sophists claim that they, better than any other men, can teach knowledge and virtue.

Now Crito is a prudent man and would prefer to know first what this new teaching is like. Hence he

⁹E. Faguet, *Pourquoi On Lise Platon*, 306.

¹⁰Compare O. Apelt, *Platonische Aufsätze*, 73; Huit, *La Vie et L'Oeuvre de Platon*, 2.191. Plato's humor has a very different genesis.

¹¹A. Saisset, quoted by Huit, *La Vie et L'Oeuvre de Platon*, 2. 195.

¹²Theognis, 429-438. For Plato's views see W. A. Hammond, *On the Notion of Virtue in the Dialogues of Plato*, in *Harvard Studies* 3 (1892), 156.

¹³The greater part of this analysis is taken from Bonitz, *Platonische Studien*, 93-104.

asks his friend Socrates to repeat as much of their conversation as he can recollect.

Socrates, with the lively temperament of the Greek, is able to recall a great deal and very obligingly acts the whole piece over again for his friend. He had found the two Sophists in the Lyceum surrounded by a crowd of listeners, among them some young Athenians of good family who were friends of Cleinias; of these Ctesippus was the most prominent. The Sophists were not only claiming that they best of all men could teach virtue, but they were also ready to guarantee that, if one relied absolutely on their instructions, he would speedily achieve the highest success in whatever he might undertake. Socrates joins the company. He assures the two Sophists that, if they are willing to give a demonstration of their art, they will find plenty of pupils, himself among them, and he is sure that everyone else who is present will, without exception, attend their lectures. He further inquires if, to profit by their teaching, it is necessary to believe that virtue can be taught and that they are able to teach it.

They reply that one need not believe anything. Then, says Socrates politely, they must be remarkably well qualified to kindle in the soul of youth the love of knowledge and of virtue.

But he does not insist on their giving at once a demonstration of how they teach all high excellence; he would appreciate it very much, however, and so would his friends, he is sure, if they would be kind enough to demonstrate that they do actually possess this skill which they have just professed, and he wishes they would show his young friend Cleinias how imperative it is that one should have an honest love of knowledge and of all high excellence. For Cleinias is but a youth and all his friends are anxious to see him educated in the right way. The Sophists are most willing to oblige, if only, they say, the youth will be kind enough to answer their questions. The comedy is on.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY, JOHN B. EDWARDS.
Clarksville, Tennessee.

(To be concluded)

REVIEW

Junior Latin. Book one. The Declension of Nouns, Adjectives and Pronouns. Roman Ideas. By John Evans Forsythe and Richard Mott Gummere. Philadelphia: Christopher Sower Company (1917). Pp. 135.

The 'latest' Regents' Report reveals a casualty list—dead, wounded and missing—at the end of the first year in Latin of about 35 per cent. This is distinctly irritating to say the least, and calls for immediate investigation. The conclusion reached by the inquisitors is—as usual—highly complimentary to the Latin teacher, but sternly condemnatory of all existing Beginners' Books. Then ensues a frantic rush on the part of the publishers to revise their most popular First Year Book. Every energetic Latin instructor is filled with a consuming ambition to produce the *Expectatus Liber Primus*, and the market is glutted each year with ideal Beginners' Books, that have been thoroughly tested in the school-room and have proven extraordinarily successful. This is precisely the condition of things that

should prevail. It is an evidence of the 'divine discontent' that betokens life and progress in Latin instruction.

Among the First Year Latin Books published in 1917, Junior Latin, by Messrs. Forsythe and Gummere, is well worth examining. It is intended for children beginning Latin at the age of ten. In the Preface the authors state that it is designed "to assist the young mind, probing darkly, by some labor-saving arrangement and presentation of the elements of Latin, as well as to equip it with the useful knowledge which is the reward for effort. From lexicons and libraries, from text-books and travel, from any and every possible source the authors have taken good things to have, the finest fruits from any tree, no matter in whose garden it grew. From Cicero and Caesar, from Lane and from Bennett, from grammars galore, from Becker, and Platner, and Friedländer, and a host of primers and readers, wherever was found a bright idea valuable to the little student, it was purloined with gratitude to the originator."

Sixty-seven pages are devoted to a systematic and complete presentation of the declension of nouns and adjectives, accompanied by easy sentences to be turned into English and Latin. Then follow about fifty pages on the remaining parts of speech, excepting only the verb, which we must assume is to be reserved for a second book.

Especially noteworthy are the following features:

- (1) An account in English of certain Roman ideas and customs, e. g. earth, water, fire, the creation, the Roman alphabet, arithmetic, dress, school, games, clocks, etc.
- (2) Old-fashioned analysis of sentences and parsing—an exercise which, however dull it may be, is bound to develop in the pupil a clear understanding of the construction of words and sentences.
- (3) Extensive vocabularies, displaying admirable unity of ideas, and suggesting many fine distinctions and shades of meaning.
- (4) Sentence quotations from many Latin authors of the Golden and Silver Ages.
- (5) Some interesting maps and pictures. The latter have the rare merit of really illustrating characteristic Roman customs.
- (6) Systematic and well-graded progression in forms and syntax.

There are but few errors, and of these still fewer are worth noticing. On page 8 the pronunciation of *ā* "as in *artistic*" is certainly misleading. The *anteponuli* (9) is defined as the third syllable before the last, which would take it altogether out of the range of Roman accent. The statement on page 13 that "An Appositive takes the case and number of the Noun or Pronoun which it explains", might better read "takes the case and (when possible) the number", etc., especially in view of the occurrence of several plural names of cities on page 24. The top sentence on page 74 reads: "the Cardinals are all Indeclinable except *unus*, *duo*, *tres* and *milīa*", thus overlooking the declension of the Latin words for the hundreds. *Condidit*, "hides" (87), and *exsuperat*, "it had surpassed" (119), are slips in point of tense. On page 115 we are told that "the boys brought candles, beginning their school-day before daylight", while on the following page we learn that "at sun-rise boys went to school".

From these trivial details let us pass to the consideration of the more important questions suggested by an examination of the book.

- (1) Will not the methods employed involve the loss of much valuable time?

Take, for example, the matter of vocabularies. It is generally admitted that the acquisition by the pupil of